REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 are pending. No claims are amended, cancelled, or added. In view of the following arguments, withdrawal of all outstanding rejections to pending claims 1-31 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,449 to Gallagher et al. in view of U.S. Patent no. 6,691,159 to Grewel et al. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 recites in part "providing context-sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer, the method comprising", and "receiving a request for context-sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer". Nowhere do the references of record teach or suggest these claimed features.

In addressing claim 1, the Office action ("Action"), asserts that Gallager at col. 3, lines 1-10 teaches "receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer". Applicant disagrees.

Firstly, let's take a look at Gallagher, col. 3, lines 1-10, which teaches:

> *"Double-clicking on a message 304 [...] within the list box results in an http request be made to the manager. This request includes: (1) a code indicating that a message help page is to be built in a new Web browser window; and (2) and identifying number [...] for the message."*

This teaching merely indicates that an http request is sent to a manager with a code indicating that a help page is to be built for a Web browser. Nowhere does this teaching, or any other portion of Gallagher teach or suggest the use of "context sensitive help", as Applicant claims. Thus, a system of Gallagher may never "receiving a request for context sensitive help", as claim 1 recites.

Additionally, and although the Action does not depend on Grewal for this teaching of claim 1, Grewal is completely silent with respect to the use of "context sensitive help". For at least these reasons, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest the recited feature of claim 1.

Accordingly, for this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Gallagher in view of Grewal is improper and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, claim 1 recites other features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For example, claim 1 further recites "responsive to receiving the request, the first computer: determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web page" and "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information", and "providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation". For the reasons already discussed, the cited combination does not teach or suggest "determining a set of context sensitive information".

In addressing the feature of "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information", and "providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation", the Action points to Gallagher col. 3, lines 18-24 and figure 5. Taking a close look at Gallagher column 3, lines 18 to 24 and figure 5, we will see that this teaching is completely silent on the recited features. Gallagher, at the indicated passage, merely teaches:

FIG. 5 illustrates this new web browser window 400 for the message 304 indicated in FIG. 4 . The new window 400 appears on top of the current Web-browser window 300, as well as the message log. Once the user views the message help text 402, he/she can close the Web browser window 400, returning to the message log browse task.

Nowhere does this teaching describe anything that is even close to ""generating a second Web page", as Applicant claims. As claim 1 recites, "a first Web page" is associated with "a request for context sensitive help". The "second Web page" is generated "comprising the context sensitive help" that was requested. Since the teaching of Gallagher does not even address "context-sensitive help" or such a "second Web page", a system of Gallagher may never "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information", as claim 1 recites. Since Gallagher may never generate such a "second Web page", a system of Gallagher may never "providing the second Web page to the second computer".

Additionally, and although the Action does not depend on Grewal for these recited teachings, Grewal is completely silent with respect to generating any "second Web page comprising the context sensitive information". For at least these additional reasons, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 1.

Accordingly, for these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Gallagher in view of Grewal is improper and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Action admits that Gallagher does not teach or suggest "providing context-sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer" as claim 1 recites. To arrive at this missing feature of Gallagher and conclude that the claimed features are obvious over the cited combination, the Action points to column to lines 22-37,

col. 4, lines 46-65, and col. 3, lines 1-7 of Grewal. This conclusion is unsupportable.

First, let's take a look at what Grewal teaches at col. 2, lines 22-37:

> *"FIG. 1 is a block diagram of a system 10 in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. System 10 includes a server system 12 and a plurality of client systems 14 connected to server system 12 . In one embodiment, a client system 14 is a computer including a web browser. Server system 12 is accessible to client system 14 via the Internet. Client system 14 is interconnected to the Internet through many interfaces including dial-in-connections, cable modems, special high- speed ISDN lines and networks such as local area networks (LANs) or wide area networks (WANs). Client system 14 could be any client system capable of interconnecting to the Internet including a web-based phone or other web-based connectable equipment. Servers storing information are integrated with server system 12 and can be accessed by potential users at one of client systems 14 by logging onto server system 12."*

Although this portion of Grewal teaches a plurality of client systems connected to a server, nowhere does this portion of Grewal teach or suggest "providing context-sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer" as claim 1 recites.

Next, let's take a look at col. 4, lines 46-65 of Grewal:

> *"FIG. 8 describes an algorithm 240 as used by the system to help a user when the user logs on to a home page of the web site through client system 14 . After logging 242 , the user requests help through client system 14 by selecting one of a hypertext link displayed out of all displayed 244 hypertext links. Once the user makes a specific selection, the specific selection is sent to server system 12 . The sending 246 is accomplished in response to click of a mouse or to a voice command. Once server system 12 receives 248 the request, server system 12 displays the information in response to this request on client system 14. Server system 12 accesses 250 the database and retrieves 252 related information from the database. The requested information is provided 254 to client system 14 by downloading the*

information from server 12 . In one embodiment, client system 14 as well as server system 12 are protected from access by unauthorized individuals."

This portion of Grewal teaches that a user logged on to a homepage in a web site may request help by selecting a hypertext link to generate a help request that is communicated to a server, which upon receipt of the request obtains information from a database. Nowhere does this portion of Grewal teach or suggest use of "context-sensitive" help of any kind. Thus this portion of Grewal does not add anything of value to Grewal's teaching of col. 2, lines 22-37, which was already discussed above.

Lastly, col. 1, lines 1-7 of Grewal teach:

"processing received request against the data storage device 44 containing a variety of help related information, a retrieving component 50 to retrieve information from the data storage device, and an information fulfillment component 54 that downloads the requested information after retrieving from the data storage device to a plurality of users in the order in which the requests were received by the receiving component."

This portion of Grewal merely teaches that help related information retrieved from a data storage device is downloaded to requesting users. This teaching is completely silent with respect to "context-sensitive" help of any kind. Thus this portion of Grewal does not add anything of value to Grewal's teachings of col. 2, lines 22-37, and/or col. 4, lines 46-65, which were already discussed above.

In view of the above, the cited portions of Grewal merely teach that a server and a distributed computing system may receive requests from clients and download help related information to users. Thus, the system of Gallagher in view of Grewal may never "providing context-sensitive help from a first computer to a

second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer" as claim 1 recites.

Accordingly, and for each of these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 2-9 should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 recites "providing context-sensitive help for a Web-based user interface (UI) of a first computer to a second computer", "receiving a request for a set of context sensitive help corresponding to a Web-based UI of the first computer, the request being received at the first computer, the Web-based UI corresponding to one or more functions of the first computer, the Web-based UI being presented on the second computer, the first computer being operatively coupled to the second computer over a network", and "responsive to receiving the request, the first computer: generating a second Web page comprising the context-sensitive help" and "communicating the second Web page to the second computer for presentation." For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 10 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 11-18 should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 recites in part "communicating the Web based UI to a different system for presentation", "responsive to receiving a request for context sensitive help, determining a set of context-sensitive help that corresponds to the Web-based UI", and "communicating the context-sensitive help to the different system for presentation." At least for the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 19 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 20-25 depend from claim 19 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the respective 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 20-25 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 26 recites in part "[a] user interface comprising [...] a first area for displaying, on a first device, a remote UI that corresponds to a second device", and "a second area within the first area for providing a context-sensitive help control for accessing a set of context sensitive help that corresponds to the remote user interface." At least for the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Gallagher in view of Grewal does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 26 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 27-31 depend from claim 26 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the respective 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 27-31 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 8/17/04

By: Brian Hart

Brian G. Hart
Reg. No. 44,421
(303) 539-0265